

A
L E T T E R

^{T O}
Mr. D E B R E T T,

BEING AN ANSWER TO

"LUCUBRATIONS"
DURING A SHORT RECESS:"

Which Pamphlet contains a Plan for altering the
Representation of the People.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
DEDICATED TO THE RIGHT HON. WM. PITT,
A PLAN FOR THE IMMEDIATE PAYMENT
OF THE NATIONAL DEBT,

TO BE INSERTED IN HIS BILL FOR AMENDING
THE REPRESENTATION,

That the whole may form a complete System.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. BLADON, No. 13, Pater-noster-Row. 1783.

Price One Shilling.

A
L E T T E R, &c.

Mr. DEBRETT,

AS the author of a pamphlet, entitled
“*Lucubrations during a short Re-
cess,*” has not thought proper to affix his
name to the publication, I have no person
to address an answer to but you, who are
the publisher; and as I mean no incivility to
any body, I trust to your not taking amiss
whatever I may say: because, when gross
ignorance offers itself to the public, and we
waste our time in reading a collection of
words which have not one syllable of ar-
gument in them, nor the smallest practica-
bility in the measures that are recom-
mended, it is not wonderful that our

B

resent-

resentment is roused, and that we use terms which, on ordinary occasions, would appear unpolite.

The author begins with stating the necessity of the present Minister's enforcing public reformation ; and affirms, as fact, a matter in which he is much mistaken, namely, that no opposition ever obtained so complete a victory over the Ministers whom they opposed. This is a matter I do not intend to argue. Admitting, therefore, that it is incumbent on every Ministry to make all necessary reforms, and that this Ministry is not bound to make those that are not necessary, I will consider, first, how far he proves that the reform, which he supposes the Ministers must attempt, is necessary ; and then, whether that which he recommends would not render the state infinitely in a worse condition than it is at present. The world is very apt to imagine, that because opposition declaims much against the system of those in power, that

that therefore they are bound, as soon as they become Ministers to make every alteration which the speculatist imagines is proper, and are tied down, right or wrong, to do that which they endeavoured to force their predecessors into; not considering, that when we see things immediately before us they appear very differently, and those which at a distance may seem eligible, when near are not only the reverse, but absolutely impracticable.

The present Ministers, says he, “ are
 “ obliged, by every tie that can possibly bind
 “ them, both in their public and in their pri-
 “ vate capacities, to propose in parliament,
 “ and to recommend to the sanction of their
 “ Sovereign, such constitutional reforma-
 “ tions as in former times they pledged
 “ themselves to support, and urged in so
 “ strong and powerful a manner, to their
 “ stubborn and obdurate opponents.”—I
 hope the Ministers will by no means sub-
 scribe to this position, for it is not founded

in reason or common sense. A person at a great distance, and seeing very indistinctly, advises and exhorts another to attempt a violent measure, but, being in the same situation himself finds it impracticable, and that he must involve himself in inextricable difficulties, is he bound at all events to hazard the attempt? Nothing, Sir, is so common as for persons perfectly ignorant of others affairs, to recommend a variety of measures, which, if they were perfectly acquainted with their circumstances, might appear unwise or impracticable.

I have said this much only to shew the author how fallaciously he argues; for it certainly is not to the purpose of reforming the representation, which never was proposed by the last opposition, which, as oppositionists, they never pledged themselves to support, and I believe is very contrary to the wishes and opinion of many of those who lately had, and also of many
of

of those who now have, a considerable share in the councils of this country.

The author next affirms, that we are fallen from a great height into an abyſs of miſery. “ *Therefore we muſt be blind in-
“ deed, if we do not perceive that there
“ muſt have been ſome ſecret ſpring which
“ has eſcaped the penetration of our ances-
“ tors, and which has proved the bitter
“ ſource of calamity and miſfortune.*” I truſt the abyſs of miſery is not ſo deep and deplorable as the author imagines ; and there appears to me reaſon to hope, that a wiſe, a reſolute, an active, and honeſt Miniſter may place this country in a reſpectable ſtation among the nations : but how does it follow (ſuppoſing the picture as gloomy as he will have it) that ſome ſecret ſpring which eſcaped the penetration of our anceſtors, hurried us down the precipice of woe ? Was the defection of the American colonies occaſioned by any ſecret ſpring ? Was the war againſt them urged on by
any

any secret engine? Was not their defection the consequence of their strength, and was not the commencement of it the favourite measure of the whole kingdom? If the gentleman has connections any where, whether they are in the city or the country, whether they are on this, or on the other side the Tweed, he must know that the voice of the people was for war; and that there was no influence of the Crown necessary to urge them into an undertaking that has proved expensive, though, I hope, neither disgraceful or ruinous. As I deny the author's premises, viz. That the Ministry are pledged to endeavour at parliamentary reform, I cannot subscribe to his conclusion that they ought to attempt it; nor can I allow, that the constitution of this country, which has been the work of ages, and still remains to be the admiration of the world, should in any degree be endangered, because some whimsical or perhaps interested man fancies he sees an imperfection: nor will I consent to remove

move a corner stone, and endanger the fabrick, because some people imagine it is not of a fashionable colour.

The alteration of the term of parliaments does not suit the author's taste, who styles himself Member for a County; I should be surprized if it did; county members would willingly sit for life; trouble and expence are not pleasant to any body, controul is still less so, but if any alteration is proper, and can be safely attempted, surely it is that which gives the electors the most frequent opportunities of signifying their approbation or dislike of the conduct of their representatives. It by no means follows, that if the elections were annual, the elected may not continue; indeed annual elections generally place the elected for life, certainly during good behaviour; but as my ideas bade me to wish that the constitution may remain unpurged by state empiricks, I will not argue in favour of any alterations, but proceed to
shew

shew that there is no necessity for any reform, and then endeavour to prove that which is proposed by the author is neither just or wise, and will render the state in a worse condition than it is at present.

The author calls this a necessary reform, and I admit, if the necessities of the state absolutely require the deprivation of any rights or property, nay even if the necessities of the state required the lives of men, all must be yielded up to indispensable necessity, because necessity has no law, it is before all, it neither is, or can be bound by any. But idle speculatists, narrow-minded, short-sighted politicians, term every thing necessary for the state which their vain and silly imaginations induce them to think would be beneficial, as if what was beneficial was absolutely necessary, and because all must give way to certain necessity, therefore every thing must yield to what a few ignorant people think of advantage.

What

What pretence of necessity is there ; has any one stated that it will save us from the power of France, or that it will restore America ? Necessity implies imminent danger ; because while there is no danger of ruin, there can be no necessity for severe reform.

*“ There are (says he) three plans which
 “ have been suggested as the best means of
 “ improving the representation of the peo-
 “ ple : The first is, by adding a certain
 “ number of members to the representatives
 “ of the different counties ; the second, by
 “ disfranchising the smaller boroughs ; the
 “ third plan proposes the subtracting a cer-
 “ tain number of borough members, and
 “ giving them to the counties, which appears
 “ indeed to be the only mode by which this
 “ grievance can be justly and safely remedied.”*

The author's arguments against the two first plans are the weakest I have yet heard ; indeed they are assertions rather than argu-

ments, and need only contradiction for confutation ; but as the plans are no favourites with me, I will leave them to his mercy.

The mixed plan, therefore, *is most unexceptionable* ; (*therefore* might have been omitted, unless the author's disapprobation is a sufficient reason for rejection, for his dislike is as good an objection as either he has been pleased to make.) But this *most unexceptionable plan* the very same paragraph tells us *is attended with various difficulties, which the most zealous partizans for such a scheme have hardly attempted to remove.*

Your author is very bold, to warrant the removal of difficulties which have affrightened those zealous partizans ; and although there are many more objections than he has been pleased to give, yet he has afforded more than he has in any degree been able to remove.

In

In the first place he tells us it is said,
*"that depriving any man of his franchise
 "is contrary to every principle of justice,
 "and if once carried into effect may intro-
 "duce a precedent capable of being con-
 "verted to very oppressive purposes."*

*"But this objection does not strike him in
 "a very strong point of view;—observe the
 "reason." "If at any former period any
 "set of men have acquired franchises,
 "which experience proves to be pernici-
 "ous to the community at large, that can-
 "not surely be accounted a sufficient ground
 "for their perpetually enjoying them."*

Would not any one suppose acquired meant
 acquired wrongfully, improperly, clan-
 denstinely, or by some unlawful means?
 Would any body, reading the sentence a-
 bove, imagine that this set of men was
 really a certain number of boroughs send-
 ing members to parliament? and that the
 acquisition here spoken of, was either pre-
 scription, that is immemorial usage, or le-

gal grants from the crown ; exercised and enjoyed, none for less than one century and many for five centuries, unimpeached as to right, and as far as appears, exercised with the strictest attention to the end and purpose for which they were originally granted, "*which experience proves to be pernicious to the community at large.*" How does the experience, or the perniciousness to the community at large appear ? In what respect does the author pretend to shew that the community is affected by his own or any other man's experience ! Or what are the pernicious consequences arising from Old Sarum sending Mr. Pitt, and Mr. Wilkinson, or Gatton, Lord Newhaven, and Mr. Mayne, as four Representatives in Parliament, of the Commons of Great-Britain ? I think myself well justified in affirming, that if there were no other reasons (and there are) the having sent to parliament four such able and respectable members, is a very sufficient ground for not violating every idea of justice. With respect to those

those two Boroughs, which the author particularly lays his iron hand on.—

“ The demand for abolishing obnoxious privileges (says he) is by no means new.”

How old clamour, oppression, and injustice are, I will not even guess at; but for our own sakes I wish they were older than our times. I never have heard antiquity pleaded in extenuation of robbery or murder, and yet they are nearly as old as the world. *“ Sovereigns have gradually lost their legal rights as opportunities occurred:”* I deny that the sovereigns of this country have been deprived of one right; but if the author's assertion has any argument, it is this,----Sovereigns have been deprived of their legal rights, when opportunities for that purpose occurred; therefore any man, or set of men, ought to be deprived of their legal rights when opportunity for that purpose occurs. It is just as good sense and argument to say, because many men have been robbed or murdered, when opportunities for those purposes

purposes occurred, therefore any man may be murdered or robbed when opportunities occur, and the inclinations of those who are villainous enough to commit those crimes, induce them to it. "Nay, and now you will expect an unanswerable argument *Have not the privileges which were enjoyed by the members of both houses of parliament been diminished?*" Some privileges (namely, the power of franking letters without writing the whole direction, and not carrying on suits during the sitting of parliament against members of either house,) have been voluntarily relinquished, the act having passed both houses with scarce a dissenting voice. But is this a reason why eighty-five boroughs shall, against their most earnest wishes, be deprived of their right of sending members to parliament? He proceeds, "*and shall the unconstitutional claims of a few petty villages be regarded!*" by what law, custom, or usage are their claims *unconstitutional*? Being perfectly legal, I apprehend

hend they are constitutional ; but if they are illegal, there needs not the interposition of the legislature to set them aside. The author has surely been much used to multitudes, who deems eighty-five a few ; and these petty villages, according to his own statement, have six thousand seven hundred and seven voters ; but I can shew some of them to have three times the number he mentions.

*“ Nor have those boroughs which have
 “ the most probable chance of being disfran-
 “ chised, such strong claims to antient fran-
 “ chises as is generally imagined—The fol-
 “ lowing is a list of the towns which en-
 “ joyed the right of sending representatives
 “ to parliament in the year 1446.”* Please to observe this is 336 years ago ; would not therefore any one imagine that none of these were to suffer, if antiquity has any claim to mercy ? and I suppose it has, by the author’s telling us *“ that those which
 “ have the most probable chance of being
 “ disfranchised, have not such strong claims*

“ to

"to ancient franchises as is imagined;" and yet, out of 99, of which number the list consists 33 are deemed to suffer.

The author then proceeds to tell us that "*the heritable jurisdiction in Scotland being a dangerous privilege, was not long since abolished, and the value of their rights left entirely to the judgment and discretion of a court of justice.*" It is not very important to Englishmen how dangerous those rights were; but whether more or less so, it ought surely to be proved that the rights enjoyed by these boroughs are equally so, before they are condemned in the same manner, admitting that the practice of Scotland is at all times right, and that England is bound on all occasions to follow so wise a director. But, Sir, instead of offering one syllable in proof, even without an affirmation of any danger attending the exercise of these rights, without a reason expressed or implied, this respectable author declares that "*after the ex-*
ample"

" ample given us on that occasion, let sub-
" boroughs as are disfranchised receive am-
" ple compensation for their property and
" their rights, and then all applications to
" the justice and the equity of the legislature
" will be prevented" which, if it can be ren-
 dered into English, I translate thus,—take
 from eighty-five boroughs the right of send-
 ing members to parliament, which right, in
 most cases, is neither to be bought nor sold
 (therefore a pecuniary value cannot be affix-
 ed) *" and give them such compensation as*
" some man, or some number of men, shall de-
" termine is ample," which must be some
 equivalent right, because gold cannot be a
 compensation for that which it cannot pur-
 chase, and one right which cannot be
 bought, can only be a compensation for
 another right which cannot be sold; *" and*
" then" (it being very immaterial whether
 the parties are satisfied or not) *" all appli-*
" cations to the legislature will be prevent-
" ed." But, if the business is so easily
 settled, if the rights are unconstitutional,

D

the

the enjoyers of them a few petty villages, and their applications and complaints perfectly immaterial, why all this trouble? take them away, and give them no consideration: for it is equally just to annihilate these rights without any compensation, as with such an one as does not satisfy the parties; and if they are dangerous and unconstitutional they deserve no recompence for their loss, but ought to suffer for retaining them so long.

“ But the great difficulty (says your author) does not lie in answering the frivolous objections that are urged against this necessary reform, but in pointing out what boroughs ought to be disfranchised, to what extent their rights ought to be diminished, and in what manner compensation ought to be given them for the privileges of which they may be deprived.”

Your author is very forgetful; for it is only the preceding paragraph but two, that he

he found a most easy mode of compensating for the loss of their rights, "*after the example of Scotland, with respect to the heritable jurisdiction*" and, only four pages before that, "*there were various difficulties which the most zealous partisans for such a scheme have hardly attempted to remove*"; but, by his clear reasoning, which I have stated correctly, they are now reduced to frivolous objections. Whether frivolous or not, others must determine; but the first is, that it is unjust to deprive any man, or set of men, of those rights which they legally (and I will add, constitutionally) obtained, and which they exercise to the best of their capacities in the manner for which they were originally granted, when no complaint of misuse has been made, and when the necessities of the state require no such deprivation. When the legality of the rights are disputed, a Court of law or Court of Parliament must determine them; and, until so disputed and determined, it cannot

be denied that they have a legal right to the enjoyment of them, until a complaint of misuse is made; and that boroughs act as consistently with those rights which the constitution has given them, as any county in the kingdom. Having, I think, shewn that there is neither necessity or reason for the reform the author proposes, I will attempt to prove that the representation would be thereby more imperfect, and the nation rendered in a worse condition than it is at present. Your author's proposition is totally to disfranchise fifteen boroughs, and to take one member from seventy more, in the stead of which he proposes that one hundred county members shall be introduced. It is very unpleasant to scrutinize the names and characters of any gentlemen, but I desire the author to examine your Court Kalendar, and say whether the thirty gentlemen sent to Parliament by these fifteen boroughs are not as proper and as upright members of Parliament as any thirty that are likely to be sent from the

the counties he proposes to increase. Sir, this author has not yet learned that every Member of Parliament is a representative of all the Commons of Great Britain, whether chosen to sit there by the electors of the county of York or of Old Sarum, and is to attend with equal regard to the welfare of the whole empire.

What is the importance, if the senator be wise and virtuous, by whom he is appointed to sit in parliament; integrity and ability are the great requisites, and is it not more probable they should appertain to men of education and fortune, than to those whose talents of noise, dissipation, and riot would render them the objects of popular election? Is a pig-merchant in the Borough of Southwark, or the son or brother of a peer, more proper Members of Parliament than Mess. Drake, Mr. Wm. Pitt, Sir Robert Clayton, Mr. Buller, Mr. Thomas Pitt, Mr. Secretary Townshend, Mr. Lister, Mess. Jolliffe, Mr. Lascelles, Lord New-

haven,

haven, Colonel Barre, and at least a hundred equally respectable (I took these only as they first occurred) that would, on the proposed plan, be entirely excluded from the probability of sitting in parliament? The great point is the choice, not who shall chuse, and until it is proved that more eligible persons would be returned for counties, there cannot be any pretence, much less any necessity, to do acts of violence and injustice to remedy that which is neither proved, nor in any respect stated as an evil by your author. But, Sir, I said, that if this vagary took place, the representation would be in a worse, that is in a more dependant state, and less at liberty to act according to their own discretion, than at present. How far it is proper, that those who elect should controul the conduct of the elected, I do not mean to argue; Mr. Burke, whose opinion every body must respect, thinks there should not be any controul, and if he is right in that position, the proposed alteration I will venture

ture

ture to say is wrong, because whether the Peer or the mob elects (and it will in all cases be the one or the other) the member will not dare to be unruly. Your author's idea is to add one hundred county members in the room of those abolished, to be chosen by freeholders of forty shillings a year in each county. I beg leave again to refer the author to the Red Book, and as he may not be much acquainted with county members and their connections, let him desire Mr. Byng or Mr. Robinson to inform him how many county members are now in this parliament, or were in the last, who are not the entire nomination of Peers; he will find half of them, at least, are the near relations or connections of Peers, without property or pretence, except such relationship or connection, to be chosen by a county; almost another fourth are elected by the interest of some two or three Peers; and I believe it will be allowed me, that if the Peers in every county were to unite, they would nominate every county member

ber

ber in the kingdom, except one indeed for Surry; for Mr. Fox, Mr. Byng, or Mr. Wilkes may indulge their vanity as they please, but believe me Sir Joseph Mawbey is the man of the people in spite of them all, and is the only one among them that could be chosen for a county, against the most determined opposition of every man of property in it. Indeed we may amuse ourselves with vain speculations, and those who are out of power may hold forth (*ad captandum vulgum*) that which in theory appears plausible, but, if reduced to practice, is dangerous, if not impossible. Every man, who has patience to consider, and judgment to determine, on the nature and importance of the House of Commons, must think that property is there the surest pledge for honesty; and although there may be some poor Members of Parliament, who act purely for the good of their country; yet I fear, on reference to history, it will be found that the men of property alone are the persons who have fought

fought the battles of the constitution, both against power before the Revolution, and against influence since. Shew me a man of large property, and I will shew you one whose interest it is to take care *ne quid detrimenti respublica capiat*, he may be biaſſed to a certain degree, but no temptation can lead him to sacrifice great constitutional points, because no gratuity, no emolument, no rank, is equal to the prosperity of his country, to the permanent security of his liberty and his property.

An increase of one hundred members, to be elected by the freeholders, would be adding one hundred connections of Peers, and excluding one hundred men of the first property in the kingdom; and I appeal to any one, who is thoroughly acquainted with the House of Commons, whether that would not be nearly the effect produced; if it would, I have made out my position: if that is not granted, let the names of county members speak the fact,

E

but

but I will take leave to say, that if there are only thirty, out of the hundred, added to the influence of Peers, it is that thirty too much ; for whatever takes from the Commons and adds to the Peers, destroys the balance, and endangers the constitution.

Mr. Debrett, your author is not only incorrect in argument, or rather has no argument, but he is so in the facts he pretends to state. If he did not imagine the number of electors in each borough was really as he states them, he shamefully imposes on the public, by making a calculation from those numbers ; and if he did suppose them correct, he knew nothing of the matter, for Willis's Notitia Parliamentaria is not even a pretence, much less an excuse for uttering obvious errors in print. He says Gatton has twelve votes ; I believe it has not half so many at present, but the right of voting there is in Scot and Lot, and though there may now be only six, there

there may, by the next election, be six thousand. In Old Sarum the number of burgages are considerable, and may be conveyed at the pleasure of the owner. He states Portsmouth to have 1000 electors; there polled only 33 at the last contest in 1780, and being a corporation now in the hands of one family, they are not very likely to be encreased to any considerable number; there polled at the last election for Coventry 3000 and more, he states 1600; for Southwark there polled 1802, he states 1500; there polled about 600 at the last Shoreham election, he states 1500; Willis is not to be charged with that falsehood. Indeed, on the best enquiry I can make, I find he is not correct in any one instance through his list. But the only boroughs where the numbers of electors can in any degree be fixed, are where the right of voting is in burgage tenures; because in those where the right of election is in scot and lot, or honorary freemen, the numbers may be infinite, are encreased in

a short time, and may, at one election, be a very small number, and at the next as many as Westminster or London : therefore the smallness of the number of electors can be no criterion, and if these boroughs imagined it could, they would soon encrease them to leave no complaint of that sort. The author, struck with his own partiality, thinks it necessary to assign a reason for having two members to Winchester, Salisbury, Andover, Harwich, Launceston, Scarborough, Marlborough, Malden, Buckingham, and Bath ; he might have added Camelford, Fowey, Grampound, and Newton, (but exactness he certainly does not aim at) when these have less than 50 electors, except Salisbury, which he states to have 56 ; and he proposes to take one member from two boroughs, that by his own account have more than 300 electors each, from five that have 200, from four that have 150, from eleven that have 100 and upwards each, and from thirty that have 50 and upwards each ; this is from
his

his own statement, and his reason is, that although they have fewer electors, they have more houses and inhabitants, (which in many instances is not true) but if it was true, the inhabitants have no concern in the election, which is limited to the corporations alone of all these towns, and it is as good a reason to say they have more trees, or more sparrows, for the one has as little to do with the election as the other. But in a scheme to render elections uncorrupt, and the representation of the people complete, to leave those that are most liable to be seduced by corruption, because the author fancies they are larger towns, when the size of the town, or the number of inhabitants has no influence in the election, is really too absurd. He is terribly shocked that Weymouth and Melcombe-Regis should return four members, which he calls Representatives; whereas their concerns might be protected by two, by one, I believe; but I must again remind your author, that these four Representatives are
not

not for those small towns, but for the whole kingdom; and Mr. Ellis does not attend the House so constantly merely to protect those who send him there, but to guard the interests of the community at large.

Your author has entirely forgot the principality of Wales; and for what reason, pray, is Agmondesham, which is as much in private, though very respectable hands, as any borough in the kingdom, and the uncorrupt Stockbridge, with Tamworth, Newton in the Isle of Wight, and York, entirely omitted? These places are not so much as named in the book, not even in what is called *A list of the different cities and boroughs in England, with the supposed number of electors in each*; for Bramber, Haslemere, and Petersfield are omitted in this list, but are inserted in the list of those that are to be deprived of one member, the first five, and all Wales, are, I suppose, to remain, as at present, but are no more noticed,

ticed, than if such places did not contribute, in any degree, to form a part of the legislature.

I now appeal to any man, who has taken the trouble to read these few pages, whether the author of these *Lucubrations* has shewn any necessity for his proposed violence and injustice? And if he will cast his eye over the list of the members of Parliament, but should happen to be ignorant of the situation in life, and the fortunes and conduct of those gentlemen, who are, by this author's plan, to be turned out of parliament, and of the connections of county members, and the influence the Peerage already has in the House of Commons, then if he will be at the trouble of asking any of those gentlemen who are, or have been Secretaries to the Treasury, or in a situation to know the fact, whether it is not incontestible that by this plan the House of Commons would retain less of the democracy, and acquire more of the
arist-

aristocracy, and consequently be in a worse state, and more subject to controul and influence, than it is at present, and if the answer shall not be in the affirmative, I am content to be called as ignorant as I am, under the necessity of saying the author of these Lucubrations in my opinion is.

I cannot, Sir, omit to take notice of the inference drawn from so much argument, and on the same principle I have taken the liberty to add a compleat plan for the immediate payment of the national debt, which, I beg leave to dedicate to the Right Honourable William Pitt; and I humbly presume to advise, that it may be inserted in the same bill with his reform of the representation of the people. Your author's words are "*Thus, if there is spirit, vigour, and wisdom enough in the legislature totally to disfranchise about seven hundred voters, who at the same time might be permitted to vote for their county representatives, and only*"

" to

“ to diminish the unreasonableness of the privileges
 “ which have been acquired by six thousand
 “ more, or, in other words, if the rights and
 “ interest of eight million be preferred to the
 “ undue, unconstitutional, and indeed absurd
 “ claims of about seven thousand individuals,
 “ and if the rights and franchises of such
 “ individuals are equally distributed among
 “ the different counties in the kingdom, the
 “ people will be represented in a manner,
 “ which, though it is possible to render it
 “ perfect in theory, it will be very difficult
 “ practically to improve.”

Conscious as I am how difficult it will be
 as ably to prove the necessity of paying the
 national debt, as your author has evinced
 that the very existence of this country, as a
 nation, depends on adopting his plan of par-
 liamentary reform, I must entreat you will
 allow me to take it for granted : and then
 Sir, if there is spirit, vigour, and wisdom
 enough in the legislature totally to extirpate
 the race of the Percys, the Howards, the

F

Russels,

Russels, the Spencers, the Montagues, the Cavendishes, and about seven hundred more families, whose property is too large to be endured (who at the same time might be permitted to settle on the coast of Africa or the island of Otaheite) and only to take from about 700 more such wretches, who dare to have a competency, half of what they possess, or in other words, if the interest, rights I might add, for they are as good in one case as the other, of eight millions be preferred to the undue, unconstitutional, and indeed absurd claims and pretences of about seven thousand individuals, and if the property of such individuals is properly disposed of, the national debt would be paid at once, the laborious and industrious poor relieved from burthen some taxes; and though in theory some people may fancy this may be effected in a less cruel manner, yet, depend on it, in practice, it will be very difficult to improve.

THE END.